

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed remarks is requested. Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-21, 26-27, 29-31, and 33 remain in the application.

### **ARGUMENT**

Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-21, 26-27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable by Omoigui (2005/0086688)(hereinafter Omoigui) in view of Stettner (2002/0104090)(hereinafter Stettner).

Independent claims 1 and 13 require that the notification of the event be transmitted over a third television channel. This third television channel is different than the first and second television channels carrying the first and second programs, respectively. In independent claims 26 and 30, a limitation requires that the television programs are being received over a first set of television channels, and the event notifications are being received over a selected specialized television channel not in the first set of television channels.

The Office action of Aug. 28, 2006 admits that Omoigui fails to disclose the limitation that the notification of the event is transmitted over a third television channel. The Examiner seeks to rectify this deficiency by citing to Stettner.

The cited text of Stettner (paragraph 32) refers to ATVEF triggers, which can be continuously updated by the local studio. Stettner discloses generally that ATVEF triggers may be inserted into a television signal. However, *Stettner does not teach or suggest that the event notifications are transmitted over a TV channel that is different than the TV channel being displayed and also different than the TV channel having the event of interest to the viewer.*

In the present claims, there are three channels: 1) the channel showing the current program; 2) the channel showing the event that the user is interested in; and 3) the channel communicating the event notification. Neither Omoigui nor Stettner, alone or in combination, teach or suggest how the **three TV channels** are used as

in the presently claimed invention. The Examiner broadly asserts that because ATVEF triggers may be inserted into the VBI of a TV signal, that this teaches the three TV channels as claimed. This is a faulty assertion. The combination of the cited art does not in fact teach or suggest the use of the three TV channels as claimed.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 13, 26, and 30 are allowable as currently presented. Additionally, all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-21, 26-27, 29-31, and 33 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-8074. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 3, 2006

Steven P. Skabrat  
s/Steven P. Skabrat/  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
Registration No. 36,279  
(503) 264-8074

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026